

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9-11 and 14-19 are now pending. Claims 12 and 13 were withdrawn as directed to a non-elected invention. Claim 1 has been amended above to incorporate the limitations of claim 4, to wit the doctor blade is movable along tangential and normal directions of the surface of the marking roller, and further to specify that the doctor blade is movable so as to follow the swelling motion (i.e. surface contour during rotation) of the marking roller. Claim 5 has been presented in independent form and to recite this feature as well. Support for this feature may be found, e.g., at page 22, lines 6-8 of applicant's specification. Claims 12 and 13 have been canceled to advance prosecution.

The Examiner required corrected drawings. A replacement formal drawing of Figure 25, correcting the informality noted by the Examiner, is submitted herewith. Approval of the herewith formal drawing is respectfully requested.

Original claims 3 and 6-8 were objected to because of noted informalities. Claims 3 and 8 have been canceled. Claims 6 and 7 have been amended above to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Original claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata et al. (USP 6,111,345) in view of Bolte et al (USP 5,671,678). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art and there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Applicant submits that the combination of Shibata and Bolte fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. For example, Applicant submits that the combination fails to teach or suggest a doctor blade that is movable along the tangential and normal directions of the surface of the marking roller so as to follow the swelling motion of the marking roller.

The Examiner states that Shibata et al. teach setting upper blade 2101 and lower blade 2500 relative to the marking roller 2202, referring to column 21, lines 9-12 (see page 6, lines 1-2 of the Office Action). However, in this passage Shibata mentions only that "supplying portion 2101 of the doctor blade 2100 and the paste removing member 2500 are set to contact the circumference of the roller portion 2201 of the marking roller 2200." (Emphasis added) Thus, Shibata is referring only to the initial placement of doctor blade 2100 and member 2500. There is no teaching or suggestion that the doctor blade is (thereafter) movable along tangential and normal directions of the surface of the marking roller so as to follow the swelling motion of the marking roller, as now recited in claims 1 and 5.

Accordingly, even if the teachings of Shibata and Bolte were combined as proposed by the Examiner, that combination would not have taught or suggested to the skilled artisan all of the limitations of amended claims 1 and 5. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejection is therefore requested.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

TANAKA
Appl. No. 10/621,498
November 24, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:



Michelle N. Lester
Reg. No. 32,331

MNL:slj
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

TANAKA
Appl. No. 10/621,498
November 24, 2004

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 25. This sheet, which includes Fig. 25, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 25.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet